



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/649,999	08/26/2003	Jheroen P. Dorenbosch	CE10990J1121	6041
34952	7590	07/05/2005	EXAMINER	
FLEIT, KAIN, GIBBONS, GUTMAN, BONGINI & BIANCO P.L. 551 N.W. 77TH STREET, SUITE 111 BOCA RATON, FL 33487			FOX, BRYAN J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2686	

DATE MAILED: 07/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/649,999	Applicant(s) DORENBOSCH ET AL.	
	Examiner Bryan J Fox	Art Unit 2686	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 August 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 9-11, 14, 16, 17, 22 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Han (US006714785B1).

Regarding **claim 1**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the claimed, “determining that a wireless device operating in a first wireless communication system is detecting a triggering event.” Upon detection of the handoff request, the service base station examines traffic resources of the adjacent base station through a base station controller to determine whether there are sufficient spare channels and proceeds to perform a handoff if there are spare channels (see column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 7), which reads on the claimed, “initiating a registration sequence with a second wireless communication system in response to determining that the wireless device is detecting the triggering event.” The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so

as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station. When it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “determining at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device; and conducting at least one of a current call and a subsequent call via the second wireless communication system in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device exceeds a first predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 9**, Han discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “aborting the registration sequence in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a second predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 10**, Han discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed, “deregistering from the second wireless communication system in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a third predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 11**, Han discloses that the mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the

claimed, "the determining at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device step is performed by movement detecting means of the wireless device."

Regarding **claim 14**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the claimed, "determining that a wireless device operating in a first wireless communication system is detecting a triggering event." The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, "measuring at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device." Upon detection of the handoff request, the service base station examines traffic resources of the adjacent base station through a base station controller to determine whether there are sufficient spare channels and proceeds to perform a handoff if there are spare channels and when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, "initiating a registration sequence with a second wireless communication system in response to determining that the wireless device is detecting a triggering event and measuring at least one of the speed and displacement to the wireless device exceeding a first predetermined threshold." When there exists an available channel, handover is performed (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34),

which reads on the claimed, "conducting current and subsequent calls via the second wireless communication system."

Regarding **claim 16**, Han discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, "aborting the registration sequence in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a second predetermined threshold."

Regarding **claim 17**, Han discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed, "deregistering from the second wireless communication system in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a third predetermined threshold."

Regarding **claim 22**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the claimed, "determining that a wireless device operating in a first wireless communication system is detecting a triggering event." Upon detection of the handoff request, the service base station examines traffic resources of the adjacent base station through a base station controller to determine whether there are sufficient spare channels and proceeds to perform a handoff if there are spare channels (see

column 8, line 66 – column 9, line 7), which reads on the claimed, “initiating a registration sequence with a second wireless communication system in response to determining that the wireless device is detecting the triggering event.” The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station. When it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “determining at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device; and conducting at least one of a current call and a subsequent call via the second wireless communication system in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device exceeds a first predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 28**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the claimed, “determining that a wireless device operating in a first wireless communication system is detecting a triggering event.” The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “measuring at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device.” Upon detection of the handoff request, the service base station examines traffic resources of the adjacent

base station through a base station controller to determine whether there are sufficient spare channels and proceeds to perform a handoff if there are spare channels and when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “initiating a registration sequence with a second wireless communication system in response to determining that the wireless device is detecting a triggering event and measuring at least one of the speed and displacement to the wireless device exceeding a first predetermined threshold.” When there exists an available channel, handover is performed (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “conducting current and subsequent calls via the second wireless communication system.”

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 2-8, 12, 15, 21, 23-27 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han in view of Hammond et al (US 20040203789A1).

Regarding **claim 2**, Han fails to expressly disclose the triggering event is at least one of a detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so the mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which reads on the claimed, "the triggering event is at least one of detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above handover when the a first system is out of range in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding **claim 3**, Han fails to disclose that the first wireless communication system is a wireless local area network and the second wireless communication system is a wide area network.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose transitioning from a WLAN to a WAN (see paragraph 34), which reads on the claimed, "the first wireless communication system is a wireless local area network and the second wireless communication system is a wide area network."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above transition from a WLAN to a WAN in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding **claim 4**, Han fails to disclose that a WLAN uses at least one protocol of IEEE standard 802.11 and Bluetooth ®.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a WLAN conforming to the 802.11 standard (see paragraph 25), which reads on the claimed, "the wireless local area network uses at least one protocol of IEEE standard 802.11 and Bluetooth ®."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above WLAN conforming to the 802.11 standard in order to take advantage of the readily available and widely used standard.

Regarding **claim 5**, Han discloses the use of CDMA, however, Han fails to expressly disclose a WAN using one of CDMA, TDMA, GSM and iDEN.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a WAN using GSM/GPRS (see paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above WAN using GSM in order to take advantage of the benefits of the GSM/GPRS network, such as long range and ubiquitous coverage as suggested by Hammond et al (see paragraph 6).

Regarding **claim 6**, Han fails to disclose that the first wireless communication system is a wide area network and the second wireless communication system is a wireless local area network.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose transitioning from a WAN to a WLAN (see paragraph 33), which reads on the claimed, "the first wireless communication system is a wide area network and the second wireless communication system is a wireless local area network."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above transition from a WLAN to a WAN in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding claim 7, Han fails to disclose that a WLAN uses at least one protocol of IEEE standard 802.11 and Bluetooth ®.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a WLAN conforming to the 802.11 standard (see paragraph 25), which reads on the claimed, "the wireless local area network uses at least one protocol of IEEE standard 802.11 and Bluetooth ®."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above WLAN conforming to the 802.11 standard in order to take advantage of the readily available and widely used standard.

Regarding **claim 8**, Han discloses the use of CDMA, however, Han fails to expressly disclose a WAN using one of CDMA, TDMA, GSM and iDEN.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a WAN using GSM/GPRS (see paragraph 6).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above WAN using GSM in order to take advantage of the benefits of the GSM/GPRS network, such as long range and ubiquitous coverage as suggested by Hammond et al (see paragraph 6).

Regarding **claim 12**, Han fails to expressly disclose the use of an accelerometer detecting means or a global positioning system means.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose the use of GPS (see paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above use of GPS in order to take advantage of the free use of the system as suggested by Hammond et al (see paragraph 28).

Regarding **claim 15**, Han fails to expressly disclose the triggering event is at least one of a detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so the mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which

reads on the claimed, "the triggering event is at least one of detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above handover when the a first system is out of range in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding **claim 21**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39). The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed invention where at least one mobile subscriber determines when to handover in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the device exceed a predetermined threshold. Han fails to disclose a wireless local area network, a second communications system or a border cell.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client with both a GPRS transceiver and a WLAN transceiver (see paragraph 39 and figure 8). A mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so the mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which reads on the claimed, "at least one cell of a wireless local area

network communication system, the at least one cell providing communication coverage within a structure having at least one egress point; at least one coverage cell of a second communication system, overlapping the at least one cell of a wireless local area network, for providing communication coverage outside the structure; at least one border cell of a wireless local area network communications system, the border cell located at the egress point of the structure, providing a transition area from the wireless local area network communication system and the second communications system,” and determining when to handover in response to determining that the device is in communication with a wireless local area network border cell.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above two different communication systems and transition between in order to extend the coverage area.

Regarding **claim 23**, Han fails to expressly disclose the triggering event is at least one of a detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so th mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which reads on the claimed, “the triggering event is at least one of detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above handover when

the a first system is out of range in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Regarding **claim 24**, the combination of Han and Hammond et al discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see Han column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “aborting the registration sequence in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a second predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 25**, the combination of Han and Hammond et al discloses that when it is determined that the base station is not moving towards the adjacent base station, the handoff is cancelled (see Han column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed, “deregistering from the second wireless communication system in response to determining that at least one of the speed and displacement of the wireless device does not exceed a third predetermined threshold.”

Regarding **claim 26**, the combination of Han and Hammond et al discloses that the mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement (see column 8, lines 25-39), which reads on the claimed, “the determining at least one of a speed and a displacement of the wireless device step is performed by movement detecting means of the wireless device.”

Regarding **claim 27**, Han fails to expressly disclose the use of an accelerometer detecting means or a global positioning system means.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose the use of GPS (see paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above use of GPS in order to take advantage of the free use of the system as suggested by Hammond et al (see paragraph 28).

Regarding **claim 29**, Han fails to expressly disclose the triggering event is at least one of a detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so th mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which reads on the claimed, "the triggering event is at least one of detection of a wireless local area network border cell and a detection of a degradation of signal quality."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above handover when the a first system is out of range in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14).

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han in view of Hammond et al and further in view of the applicants' admission of prior art.

Regarding **claim 18**, Han discloses that a mobile continuously measures pilot signal power from the adjacent base station and sends a handoff request to the service base station when the measured value is higher than a threshold (see column 8, lines 25-39). The mobile station reports the location flag, direction flag and displacement to the base station so as to perform a handoff taking into consideration the traveling direction of the mobile station (see column 8, line 25 – column 9, line 34), which reads on the claimed, “means for measuring speed and displacement of the wireless device, communicatively coupled to the controller,” and, handover manager for determining when to handover in response to speed and displacement of the device exceed a first predetermined threshold. Han fails to disclose two transceivers designed to operate on a separate wireless communications system and a determining that the wireless device is in communication with a wireless local area network border cell.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose a mobile client with both a GPRS transceiver and a WLAN transceiver (see paragraph 39 and figure 8), which reads on the claimed, “at least two transceivers, each transceiver designed to operate on a separate wireless communications system, for transmitting and receiving wireless information.” A mobile client moves from a data connection to a WLAN and the WLAN signal is lost due to range, so the mobile client makes an attachment to the more costly

GPRS system (see paragraph 47), which reads on the claimed, "determining that the wireless device is in communication with a wireless local area network border cell."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above two different system transceivers and handover when the a first system is out of range in order to eliminate the need for a user to manually change systems and provide a better method and system allowing use of a device in both networks (see paragraphs 13-14) and extend the coverage area. The combination of Han and Hammond et al fails to expressly disclose the use of system stacks.

The applicant admits as prior art the use of wireless system stacks (see page 3, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Han and Hammond et al to include the above wireless system stacks in order to allow optimal operation on each of the systems.

Regarding **claim 19**, as applied to claim 18 above, Han fails to expressly disclose the use of an accelerometer detecting means and a global positioning system means.

In a similar field of endeavor, Hammond et al disclose the use of GPS (see paragraph 25).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Han with Hammond et al to include the above use of GPS in

Art Unit: 2686

order to take advantage of the free use of the system as suggested by Hammond et al (see paragraph 28).

Claims 13 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Han in view of Hammond et al as applied to claims 12 and 19 above, and further in view of Mantyjarvi et al (US 20030109258A1).

Regarding **claims 13 and 20**, the combination of Han and Hammond et al fails to disclose the use of an accelerometer detecting means comprising at least three independent axes.

In a similar field of endeavor, Mantyjarvi et al disclose a terminal with an accelerometer block that comprises one or more accelerometers measuring acceleration in at least three orthogonal directions (see paragraph 37), which reads on the claimed, "accelerometer detecting means comprising at least three independent axes."

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the combination of Han and Hammond et al with Mantyjarvi et al to include the above use of an accelerometer in order to determine movement of the device as suggested by Mantyjarvi et al (see paragraph 6) without the need for GPS equipment and signals.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Lee et al (US 20030153312A1) disclose an integrated smart local wireless spread spectrum communication system.

Rajkotia et al (US 20040121774A1) disclose an apparatus and method for performing an interfrequency handoff in a wireless network.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bryan J Fox whose telephone number is (571) 272-7908. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold can be reached on (571) 272-7905. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Bryan Fox
May 27, 2005

Marsha D Banks-Harold
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600